

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JUNE 8, 2006

SENATE BILL

No. 1287

Introduced by Senator Ducheny

February 14, 2006

An act relating to social services.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1287, as amended, Ducheny. Local Revenue Fund: Social Services and Caseload Subaccounts: program: funding.

Under existing law, the Controller allocates specified funds from the Social Services Subaccount of the Sales Tax Account of, and the Caseload Subaccount of the Sales Tax Growth Account of, the Local Revenue Fund to counties, for the purpose of financing various programs for the provision of services to needy children and adults.

This bill would require the ~~Legislative Analyst~~ *Welfare Policy Research Project of the University of California, in conjunction with utilizing data and information provided by the Department of Finance and the State Department of Social Services*, to compile data and submit a report to the Legislature and the Governor by April 1, 2008, that would include specified information relating to the funding of programs funded from the Social Services Subaccount of the Sales Tax Account of, and the Caseload Subaccount of the Sales Tax Growth Account of, the Local Revenue Fund, in relation to a specified realignment of social services programs and the funding thereof, enacted in 1991.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: ~~no~~ yes. State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. By April 1, 2008, ~~the Legislative Analyst, in~~
2 ~~conjunction with the State Department of Social Services, shall~~
3 ~~compile data and submit a report to the Legislature and the~~ *the*
4 *Welfare Policy Research Project of the University of California,*
5 *utilizing data and information provided by the Department of*
6 *Finance and the State Department of Social Services, shall*
7 *submit a report to the Legislature and the Governor, that*
8 identifies all of the following:

9 ~~(a) (1) The current and historical levels of state, federal, and~~
10 ~~local funding for programs funded from the Social Services~~
11 ~~Subaccount of the Sales Tax Account of, and the Caseload~~
12 ~~Subaccount of the Sales Tax Growth Account of, the Local~~
13 ~~Revenue Fund, as a result of the 1991 program realignment~~
14 ~~pursuant to Chapter 89 of the Statutes of 1991.~~

15 ~~(2) The current and historical caseload levels of programs~~
16 ~~funded from the Social Services Subaccount of the Sales Tax~~
17 ~~Account of, and the Caseload Subaccount of the Sales Tax~~
18 ~~Growth Account of, the Local Revenue Fund.~~

19 ~~(3) An analysis of the cost-sharing ratios enacted by the 1991~~
20 ~~(a) An analysis of the cost-sharing ratios enacted by the 1991~~
21 ~~program realignment, and the current ability of these ratios to~~
22 ~~provide service levels necessary to meet caseload levels needs,~~
23 ~~and whether the cost-sharing ratios established in the~~
24 ~~realignment create program incentives that may not best serve~~
25 ~~the programmatic needs.~~

26 ~~(b) (1) The original Changes to the revenue streams dedicated~~
27 ~~to the programs funded from the Social Services Subaccount of~~
28 ~~the Sales Tax Account of, and the Caseload Subaccount of the~~
29 ~~Sales Tax Growth Account of, the Local Revenue Fund.~~

30 ~~(2) Changes to the revenue streams specified in paragraph (1):~~

31 ~~(3) The impact of the changes specified in paragraph (2) on~~
32 ~~actual funding levels, compared to any available projections from~~
33 ~~the original revenue streams.~~

34 ~~(2) An analysis of the impacts of changes in the revenue~~
35 ~~stream and changes in caseloads and changes in the revenue~~
36 ~~stream or changes in caseloads to programs specified in~~
37 ~~paragraph (1), including any disproportionate programmatic~~
38 ~~growth.~~

1 (c) The effects of policy changes since 1991 on the Social
2 Services Subaccount of the Sales Tax Account of, and the
3 Caseload Subaccount of the Sales Tax Growth Account of, the
4 Local Revenue Fund, and the programs funded from these
5 accounts.

6 (d) *An analysis of any variations between counties when*
7 *realignment revenues are compared to the costs of realigned*
8 *programs.*

O